

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 13, 15 – 25 and 27 – 29 are pending.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

2. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
3. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Monplaisir Hamilton on 2/9/2011.

Claims have been amended as follows:

19. (Previously) Computer-accessible storage ~~devices~~ ~~media~~ ("~~media~~") having components for performing a method of safely modifying user application preferences for when and how an application is to operate on a computer of a user, the method comprising:

recognizing user input data relevant to the application as a prioritized user choice setting, wherein the prioritized user choice setting determines at least one property of execution of at least one event of the application;

securing the prioritized user choice setting as a protected value using an access control indicator, wherein the access control indicator prohibits the application from modifying the prioritized user choice setting;

receiving a request from the application to modify the prioritized user choice setting;

in response to the request from the application to modify the prioritized user choice setting, generating an approval user interface requesting authorization from the user to modify the prioritized user choice setting in accordance with the modification request received;

receiving input from the user approving modification of the prioritized user choice setting associated with the application to be consistent with a value stated in the request received from the application;

modifying the access control indicator to permit modification of the prioritized user choice setting associated with the application to match the value stated in the request received from the application;

modifying the prioritized user choice setting to match the value stated in the request received from the application in accordance with the received user input;

restoring the access control indicator to prohibit further modification of the prioritized user choice setting; and

generating a change notification to the user once the prioritized user choice setting has been modified.

20. (Currently Amended)

The media devices of Claim 19, wherein the computer of the user includes an operating system having a registry, wherein the protected value is a registry key stored

in the registry, wherein the access control indicator an access control list (ACL) that has been initialized to prevent writing to the protected value, and wherein modifying the access control indicator includes modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value.

21. (Currently Amended) The ~~media~~ devices of Claim 20, wherein the operating system also includes a security subsystem, and wherein modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes providing to the user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system.

22. (Currently Amended) The ~~media~~ devices of Claim 21, wherein modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes providing to the user ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures, and wherein ownership of the registry key automatically provides to the user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system.

23. (Currently Amended) The ~~media~~ devices of Claim 20, wherein providing to the user ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures includes temporarily providing to the user ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures.

24. (Currently Amended) The ~~media~~ devices of Claim 21, wherein

modifying the access control indicator to permit modification of the prioritized user choice setting associated with the application to be consistent with the modification request received includes requiring user to modify the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system.

25. (Currently Amended) The ~~media~~ devices of Claim 24, wherein restoring the access control indicator to prohibit further modification of the prioritized user choice setting includes returning ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures to the operating system.

26. (Canceled).

27. (Currently Amended) The media of Claim 19, wherein the change notification identifies the application and the contents of the prioritized user choice setting before and after the modification.

28. (Currently Amended) The ~~media~~ devices of Claim 19, wherein the user choice setting includes at least one of a user preference relating to a file association, an autoplay setting, contents of a start menu, a registered client setting, a protocol handler, a MME type handler, a task association, a Web browser home page, a reset Web page setting, and a sidebar setting.

29. (Currently Amended) The media devices of Claim 28, wherein the prioritized user choice setting includes the registered client setting, and wherein the registered client setting includes at least one of a Web browser, e-mail, media player, instant messaging, and virtual machine for Java setting.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1 – 13, 15 – 25 and 27 – 29 are allowed.
5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:
6. Appellant's have been deemed persuasive and art rejections have been withdrawn.
7. Appellant submits that the cited art, including Freund, Beilinson, and Arai, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, securing, at the computing device of the user, the user choice setting as a protected value using an access control indicator, wherein the access control indicator prohibits a second application from modifying the prioritized user choice setting associated with the first application without authorization from the user," receiving, at the computing device of the user, a request from the second application to modify the prioritized user choice setting associated with the first application; in response to receiving the request from the second application to modify the prioritized user choice setting associated with the first application, generating an approval user interface on the computing device of the user, the approval user interface requesting authorization from the user to modify the prioritized user choice setting

associated with the first application to be consistent with the modification request received from the second application, as recited in independent claim 1.

8. The Office relies upon Freund, at paragraph [0023]; Beilinson, at paragraphs [0006] and [0065]; and Arai, at paragraphs [0002] and [0013] to render the invention of independent claim 1 unpatentable.

9. The Office admits that Beilinson and Arai alone and in combination do not describe or suggest securing, at the computing device of the user, the user choice setting as a protected value using an access control indicator, wherein the access control indicator prohibits a second application from modifying the prioritized user choice setting associated with the first application without authorization from the user. The Office alleges that Freund, at paragraph [0023], in combination with Beilinson and Arai describes or suggest this element.

10. Freund, at paragraph [0023], in combination with Beilinson and Arai do not describe or suggest securing, at the computing device of the user, the user choice setting as a protected value using an access control indicator, wherein the access control indicator prohibits a second application from modifying the prioritized user choice setting associated with the first application without authorization from the user as recited in claim 1.

11. In fact, the cited portions of Freund describe a method of blocking attempts to invoke a system service based on rules that specify the services accessible by an application. Freund, at paragraph [0023], explains that communications between processes are monitored and allowed based on policy rules. At best, Freund, at

paragraphs [0023], [0041-0043] and [0079]-[0082], prevents an application from accessing a communication service, e.g., Internet service. Freund fails to describe or suggest securing, at the computing device of the user, the user choice setting as a protected value using an access control indicator. Freund fails to describe or suggest an access control indicator that prohibits a second application from modifying the prioritized user choice setting associated with the first application without authorization from the user. Beilinson and Arai in combination with Freund do not describe or suggest the access control indicator that prohibits modification of a user choice setting. Nothing in Beilinson and Arai in combination with Freund describes or suggests a second application that is prohibited from modifying the prioritized user choice setting associated with the first application without authorization from the user. Furthermore, Beilinson and Arai in combination with Freund fails to describe or suggest a user choice setting that is a protected value as recited in independent claim 1.

12. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RODERICK TOLENTINO whose telephone number is

(571)272-2661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roderick Tolentino
Examiner
Art Unit 2439

/R. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2439

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439